



Foreign Policy -- Defense -- Documents on the web -- April 2010

GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS:

The White House

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT TO THE TROOPS

The White House. Office of the Press Secretary. Clamshell, Bagram Airfield. March 28, 2010.

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-troops>

REMARKS BY PRESIDENT OBAMA AND PRESIDENT KARZAI OF AFGHANISTAN AFTER MEETING

The White House. Office of the Press Secretary. Presidential Palace, Kabul, Afghanistan. March 28, 2010.

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-obama-and-president-karzai-afghanistan-after-meeting>

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT BIDEN: THE ENDURING PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND ISRAEL

The White House. Office of the Vice President. Tel Aviv University. March 11, 2010.

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-vice-president-biden-enduring-partnership-between-united-states-and-israel>

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT BIDEN AND PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY PRESIDENT MAHMOUD ABBAS

The White House. Office of the Vice President. Muq'ata, Ramallah. March 10, 2010.

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-vice-president-biden-and-palestinian-authority-president-mahmoud-abbas>

REMARKS BY PRESIDENT OBAMA AND PRESIDENT PREVAL OF THE REPUBLIC OF HAITI

The White House. Office of the Press Secretary. Rose Garden. March 10, 2010.

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-obama-and-president-preval-republic-haiti>

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT BIDEN AND PRIME MINISTER NETANYAHU IN A JOINT STATEMENT TO THE PRESS

The White House. Office of the Vice President. Prime Minister's Residence, Jerusalem. March 9, 2010.

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-vice-president-biden-and-prime-minister-netanyahu-a-joint-statement-press>

REMARKS BY PRESIDENT OBAMA AND PRESIDENT FUNES OF EL SALVADOR AFTER MEETING

The White House. Office of the Press Secretary. Oval Office. March 8, 2010.

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-obama-and-president-funes-el-salvador-after-meeting>

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT ON THE ELECTIONS IN IRAQ

The White House. Office of the Press Secretary. Rose Garden. March 7, 2010.

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-elections-iraq>

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT ON THE EARTHQUAKE IN CHILE

The White House. Office of the Press Secretary. Rose Garden. February 27, 2010.

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-earthquake-chile>

Department of State

2009 YEAR IN REVIEW: SMART POWER IN ACTION.

U.S. Department of State. March 1, 2010. 24 pages.

<http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/137690.pdf>

REMARKS AT THE SIGNING OF A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING ESTABLISHING THE U.S.-SOUTH AFRICA DIALOGUE

By Hillary Rodham Clinton, Secretary of State. South African Foreign Minister Maite Nkoana-Mashabane. Treaty Room, Washington, DC. April 14, 2010.

<http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2010/04/140237.htm>

REMARKS WITH TURKISH FOREIGN MINISTER AHMET DAVUTOGLU BEFORE THEIR MEETING

By Hillary Rodham Clinton, Secretary of State. Washington Convention Center, Washington, DC. April 13, 2010.

<http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2010/04/140122.htm>

SIGNING OF THE PLUTONIUM DISPOSITION PROTOCOL

By Hillary Rodham Clinton, Secretary of State. Remarks with Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov. Washington Convention Center, Washington, DC. April 13, 2010.

<http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2010/04/140120.htm>

CALL FOR PEACEFUL DIALOGUE IN THAILAND

By Hillary Rodham Clinton, Secretary of State. Washington, DC. April 12, 2010.

<http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2010/04/140065.htm>

REMARKS WITH UNITED NATIONS SECRETARY GENERAL BAN KI-MOON BEFORE THEIR MEETING

By Hillary Rodham Clinton, Secretary of State. Washington, DC. April 12, 2010.

<http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2010/04/140060.htm>

THE DEATH OF POLISH PRESIDENT KACZYNSKI AND HIS DELEGATION

By Hillary Rodham Clinton, Secretary of State. Washington, DC. April 10, 2010.

<http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2010/04/139964.htm>

REMARKS ON NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION AT THE UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE AS PART OF THE MCCONNELL CENTER'S SPRING LECTURE SERIES

By Hillary Rodham Clinton, Secretary of State. University of Louisville, Louisville, KY. April 9, 2010.

<http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2010/04/139958.htm>

OUR GIANT STEP TOWARDS A WORLD FREE FROM NUCLEAR DANGER

By Hillary Rodham Clinton, Secretary of State. Op-Ed in UK's The Guardian, Germany's Berliner Zeitung, Frankfurter Rundschau, Kölner Stadt-Anzeiger and Mitteldeutsche Zeitung, and Poland's Gazeta Wyborcza. April 7, 2010.

<http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2010/04/139821.htm>

ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE RELEASE OF THE NUCLEAR POSTURE REVIEW

By Hillary Rodham Clinton, Secretary of State. Secretary of Defense Robert Gates, Secretary of Energy Steven Chu and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Michael Mullen. Washington, DC. April 6, 2010.

<http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2010/04/139929.htm>

ATTACK ON U.S. CONSULATE IN PESHAWAR

By Hillary Rodham Clinton, Secretary of State. Washington, DC. April 5, 2010.

<http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2010/04/139456.htm>

INTERNATIONAL DONORS CONFERENCE: TOWARDS A NEW FUTURE FOR HAITI

By Hillary Rodham Clinton, Secretary of State. United Nations Headquarters. New York City. March 31, 2010.

<http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2010/03/139313.htm>

BOMBINGS IN MOSCOW

By Hillary Rodham Clinton, Secretary of State. Washington, DC. March 29, 2010.

<http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2010/03/139178.htm>

COMMON THEMES IN TERRORIST ACTS

By Hillary Rodham Clinton, Secretary of State. Ottawa, Canada. March 29, 2010.

<http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2010/03/139285.htm>

OPENING SESSION OF THE U.S.-PAKISTAN STRATEGIC DIALOGUE

By Hillary Rodham Clinton, Secretary of State. Remarks With Pakistani Foreign Minister Makhdoom Shah Mahmood Qureshi. Benjamin Franklin Room, Washington, DC. March 24, 2010.

<http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2010/03/138984.htm>

REMARKS WITH PAKISTANI FOREIGN MINISTER MAKHDOOM SHAH MAHMOOD QURESHI AT RECEPTION FOR THE U.S.-PAKISTAN STRATEGIC DIALOGUE

By Hillary Rodham Clinton, Secretary of State. Richard Holbrooke, Special Representative for Afghanistan and Pakistan. Benjamin Franklin Room, Washington, DC. March 24, 2010.

<http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2010/03/138997.htm>

REMARKS WITH PAKISTANI FOREIGN MINISTER MAKHDOOM SHAH MEHMOOD QURESHI AFTER THEIR MEETING

By Hillary Rodham Clinton, Secretary of State. Treaty Room, Washington, DC. March 24, 2010.

<http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2010/03/138996.htm>

REMARKS AT THE 2010 AIPAC POLICY CONFERENCE

By Hillary Rodham Clinton, Secretary of State. Washington Convention Center, Washington, DC. March 22, 2010.

<http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2010/03/138722.htm>

REMARKS WITH UNITED NATIONS SECRETARY GENERAL BAN KI-MOON, RUSSIAN FOREIGN MINISTER SERGEY LAVROV, EU HIGH REPRESENTATIVE CATHERINE ASHTON, AND QUARTET SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE TONY BLAIR AFTER THEIR MEETING

By Hillary Rodham Clinton, Secretary of State. Osobnyak, Moscow, Russia. March 19, 2010.

<http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2010/03/138634.htm>

Department of Defense

NUCLEAR POSTURE REVIEW REPORT

U.S. Department of Defense. April 2010. 72 pages.

<http://www.defense.gov/npr/docs/2010%20Nuclear%20Posture%20Review%20Report.pdf>

PENTAGON CHANGES “DON’T ASK, DON’T TELL” ENFORCEMENT

By Army Sgt. 1st Class Michael J. Carden, Armed Forces Information Services. Joint Chiefs of Staff. March 25, 2010.

<http://www.jcs.mil/newsarticle.aspx?ID=240>

Congressional Research Service

Just clicking on the links won’t open the documents. Please copy/paste the urls in your browser to be able to read them.

NORTH KOREA’S 2009 NUCLEAR TEST: CONTAINMENT, MONITORING, IMPLICATIONS

By Jonathan Medalia. Congressional Research Service. April 2, 2010. 37 pages.

<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/140543.pdf>

JUDICIAL ACTIVITY CONCERNING ENEMY COMBATANT DETAINEES: MAJOR COURT RULINGS

By Jennifer K. Elsea, Michael John Garcia. Congressional Research Service. April 1, 2010. 21 pages.

<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/140544.pdf>

CENTRAL ASIA’S SECURITY: ISSUES AND IMPLICATIONS FOR U.S. INTERESTS

By Jim Nichol. Congressional Research Service. March 11, 2010. 71 pages.

<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/139241.pdf>

IRAN: U.S. CONCERNS AND POLICY RESPONSES

By Kenneth Katzman. Congressional Research Service. March 11, 2010. 64 pages.

<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/138769.pdf>

AFGHANISTAN CASUALTIES: MILITARY FORCES AND CIVILIANS

By Susan G. Chesser. Congressional Research Service. March 8, 2010. 5 pages.

<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/139237.pdf>

AFGHANISTAN: U.S. FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

By Curt Tarnoff. Congressional Research Service. March 5, 2010. 20 pages.

<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/139236.pdf>

IRAQ: POLITICS, ELECTIONS, AND BENCHMARKS

By Kenneth Katzman. Congressional Research Service. March 3, 2010. 21 pages.

<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/139235.pdf>

THE EUROPEAN UNION: LEADERSHIP CHANGES RESULTING FROM THE LISBON TREATY

By Derek E. Mix. Congressional Research Service. March 3, 2010. 10 pages.

<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/139234.pdf>

CHILE: POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC CONDITIONS AND U.S. RELATIONS

By Peter J. Meyer. Congressional Research Service. March 2, 2010. 21 pages.

<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/139233.pdf>

AFGHANISTAN: POST-TALIBAN GOVERNANCE, SECURITY, AND U.S. POLICY

By Kenneth Katzman. Congressional Research Service. March 1, 2010. 93 pages.

<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/138770.pdf>

WAR BONDS IN THE SECOND WORLD WAR: A MODEL FOR A NEW IRAQ/AFGHANISTAN WAR BOND?

By James M. Bickley. Congressional Research Service. March 1, 2010. 7 pages.

<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/139230.pdf>

THINK TANKS AND RESEARCH CENTERS:

The opinions expressed in these publications do not necessarily reflect the views of the U.S. Government

AFGHANISTAN

AFGHANISTAN AND OBAMA: TRANSPARENCY, CREDIBILITY AND A LONG WAR

By Anthony H. Cordesman. Center for Strategic and International Studies. April 12, 2010.

<http://csis.org/publication/afghanistan-and-obama>

It has been over a year since President Obama announced the outline of a new strategy for Afghanistan and Pakistan, and well over half a year since the appoint of General McChrystal and Ambassador Eikenberry led to efforts to define and implement that strategy in practical terms.

SHAPING THE WAR IN AFGHANISTAN: THE SITUATION IN THE SPRING OF 2010

By Anthony H. Cordesman. Center for Strategic and International Studies. April 9, 2010. 90 pages.

http://csis.org/files/publication/100409_Afghan_Friday.pdf

As General McChrystal has stated, the steady deterioration that has taken place since 2003 seems to have halted. ISAF and the Afghan government have begun to implement a strategy, new ISAF and Afghan resources are being deployed, and a more integrated civil-military effort is just beginning to take place in the field. The battle of Marja is the first major test of this strategy. This briefing details the political-military situation in Afghanistan going into the Spring of 2010.

FROM THE FERGHANA VALLEY TO SOUTH WAZIRISTAN

By Thomas M. Sanderson, Daniel Kimmage, and David A. Gordon. Center for Strategic and International Studies. March 25, 2010. 37 pages.

http://csis.org/files/publication/100324_Sanderson_FerghanaValley_WEB_0.pdf

Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan are active fronts in the wider conflict against violent extremism centered on Afghanistan and Pakistan. Although these states are less prominent in discussions about U.S. security interests in the region than nuclear-armed Pakistan, their stability is an important and unacknowledged component of the AfPak equation.

SOLVING AFGHANISTAN: ELEPHANT IN THE ROOM IS INDO-PAKISTAN RIVALRY

By Harsh V. Pant. YaleGlobal. February 1, 2010.

<http://yaleglobal.yale.edu/content/solving-afghanistan-elephant-room-indo-pakistan-rivalry>

The recent London Conference on Afghanistan showed the growing frustration of the world's major powers with the situation in that country and their desperate desire for a way out. Afghan president Hamid Karzai wants reconciliation with elements of the Taliban while the U.S. proposes offering financial incentives to encourage talks. But the Taliban rejected reconciliation and is unwilling to negotiate. Key to getting the Taliban to the negotiating table is Pakistan's active support, according to professor Harsh V. Pant.

AFRICA AND MIDDLE EAST

YEMEN: ON THE BRINK

By Sarah Phillips. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. March 11, 2010. 26 pages.
http://www.carnegieendowment.org/files/yemen_tribes.pdf

Western policy makers are scrambling to respond decisively to Yemen's instability after the failed Christmas Day attack on a U.S. passenger jet was tied to al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula. But there are limits to how much foreign intervention can accomplish Yemen's political system needs to become less centralized and more inclusive.

ON THE ISSUES: DARFUR

By Jon Temin and Chester Crocker. U.S. Institute of Peace. March 1, 2010.
<http://www.usip.org/resources/the-issues-darfur>

The seven-year conflict in Darfur, Sudan has claimed the lives of hundreds of thousands of Darfuris and left millions homeless, amid clashes among various rebel groups, government forces and allied militias. In what could be a step towards ending that conflict, the Sudanese government and the Darfuri rebel group, Justice and Equality Movement (JEM), signed a cease-fire agreement on February 23, 2010.

SOMALIA: A NEW APPROACH

By Bronwyn E. Bruton. Council on Foreign Relations. Center for Preventive Action. March 2010. 61 pages.

http://www.cfr.org/content/publications/attachments/Somalia_CSR52.pdf

Even among failed states, those countries unable to exercise authority over their territory and provide the most basic services to their people, Somalia stands apart. A country of some nine million, it has lacked a central government since the fall of Mohamed Siad Barre's regime in 1991. Poverty and insecurity are endemic. Less than 40 percent of Somalis are literate, more than one in ten children dies before turning five, and a person born in Somalia today cannot assume with any confidence that he or she will reach the age of fifty. Failed states provide fertile ground for terrorism, drug trafficking, and a host of other ills that threaten to spill beyond their borders. Somalia is thus a problem not just for Somalis but for the United States and the world.

THE FAILURE OF JIHAD IN SAUDI ARABIA

By Thomas Hegghammer. Combating Terrorism Center at West Point. February 25, 2010. 27 pages.

http://ctc.usma.edu/CTC_OP_Hegghammer_Final.pdf

This paper traces and assesses al-Qa'ida's efforts to launch an insurgency in Saudi Arabia from the mid-1990s until today. It examines the background of Usama bin Ladin's 1996 declaration of jihad, al-Qa'ida's activities in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia from 1996 to 2002, and the causes and evolution of the campaign waged by the group "al-Qa'ida on the Arabian Peninsula" (AQAP) from 2003 to 2006.

DEFENSE

ENDING F-22A PRODUCTION: COSTS AND INDUSTRIAL BASE IMPLICATIONS OF ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

By Obaid Younossi, Kevin Brancato, John C. Graser, Thomas Light, Rena Rudavsky, Jerry M. Sollinger. RAND Corporation. Prepared for the United States Air Force. March 2, 2010. 120 pages.

http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2010/RAND_MG797.pdf

In April 2009, the Department of Defense decided to terminate production of the F-22A Raptor and close the production line after the last aircraft delivery. The report evaluates the implications of three shutdown options for the F-22A industrial capability: shutdown; shutdown and restart; and “warm” production, in which a small number of aircraft are produced until and if a decision is made to return to full-rate production. Issues such as the availability of skilled labor, processes, facilities, and tooling used by firms supporting F-22A production, are likely to affect some suppliers.

AIR FORCE CYBER COMMAND (PROVISIONAL) DECISION SUPPORT

By Richard Mesic, Myron Hura, Martin C. Libicki, Anthony M. Packard, Lynn M. Scott. RAND Corporation. Prepared for the United States Air Force. 2010. 37 pages.

http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2010/RAND_MG935.1.pdf

Because cyberspace can affect core missions and capabilities, it seems obvious that the Air Force should take steps to establish an organization to address this medium. The details have been difficult to establish, however, because this medium is very different from air and space. The Air Force initially instituted a provisional major command and but has since instead replaced it with a numbered air force, the 24th Air Force, under Space Command. The authors have been involved in efforts to make the missions, tasks, and capabilities of such a command more concrete. Here, they offer observations originally intended for the major command but that apply equally well to the efforts of 24th Air Force: the needs to articulate objectives clearly; establish strategies, missions, and tasks; and develop people capable of ensuring that USAF-specific needs are met. The Air Force must also consider that cyber-related responsibilities spread across the military and other government agencies. But to expand its mission to “fly and fight in cyberspace,” the Air Force should also advance the state of the art in creating effects using cyberspace.

VISION MEETS REALITY: 2010 QDR AND 2011 DEFENSE BUDGET

By Travis Sharp. Center for a New American Security. February 2010. 8 pages.

http://www.cnas.org/files/documents/publications/2011DefenseBudget_Sharp_Feb2010_code904_policybrf_1.pdf

This policy brief provides an analysis of the FY 2011 defense budget request, places it in the context of the 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review and historical budgetary trends, and outlines the uncertain budgetary future that looms ahead.

EUROPE

SALVAGING THE CONVENTIONAL ARMED FORCES IN EUROPE TREATY REGIME: OPTIONS FOR WASHINGTON

By Anne Witkowski, Dr. Sherman Garnett, Dr. Jeff McCausland. The Brookings Institution. March 2010. 36 pages.

http://www.brookings.edu/~media/Files/rc/papers/2010/03_armed_forces_europe_treaty/03_armed_forces_europe_treaty.pdf

Russia's "suspension" of the implementation of the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE) since December 2007, and its recognition of Abkhazia and South Ossetia as independent states following the Georgia-Russia conflict in August 2008 cast a long shadow over the future of the CFE Treaty. These actions make longstanding efforts to transition to the follow-on Adapted CFE Treaty difficult at best. Some in Washington and Europe feel that new efforts are required to shake loose the logjam. For others, the treaty has less and less relevance to the evolving European security environment, and little should be done to save it. This paper examines a set of issues crucial for understanding if and how the treaty matters, possible U.S. options to address the current dilemma, and the likely consequences if the treaty should fail to survive the current challenges.

TROUBLED PARTNERSHIP: U.S.-TURKISH RELATIONS IN AN ERA OF GLOBAL GEOPOLITICAL CHANGE

By F. Stephen Larrabee. RAND Corporation. Prepared for the United States Air Force. February 3, 2010. 164 pages.

http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND_MG899.pdf

A strong security partnership with Turkey has been an important element of U.S. policy for the last five decades. However, in the last few years, U.S.-Turkish relations have seriously deteriorated, and today they are badly in need of repair. The arrival of a new administration in Washington presents an important opportunity to put Washington's relations with Ankara on a firmer footing. Turkey plays a critical role in four areas of increasing strategic importance to the United States: the Balkans, Central Asia and the Caucasus, the Middle East, and the Persian Gulf. In each of these areas, Ankara's cooperation is vital to achieving U.S. policy objectives.

FOREIGN AID

CAPACITY FOR CHANGE

By Margaret Lane Taylor, Noam Unger. Center for Strategic and International Studies. April 7, 2010. 79 pages.

http://csis.org/files/publication/100407_Unger_CapacityForChange.pdf

The U.S. government is in the midst of a serious review of how to engage more effectively with developing countries. A significant part of this reflection entails debates about how best to reform foreign aid, and there is a stunningly broad consensus that improvement is

needed across the board. New legislation has recently been introduced in the U.S. Congress.

THE RE-FOUNDATION OF HAITI: BUILDING A STRONG BASE WITH EDUCATION

By Anda Adams. The Brookings Institution. March 23, 2010.

http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2010/0323_haiti_education_winthrop.aspx

On March 31, the Haitian government, the United States, and the United Nations co-hosted an international donors' conference, "Towards a New Future for Haiti," at U.N. headquarters in New York. A few months after a massive earthquake shook Haiti, humanitarian assistance and recovery efforts are still the focal point, but increasingly with an eye turned toward reconstruction, or "re-foundation," as Prime Minister Jean Max Bellerive has called it, and long-term development of the country. In particular, the education system in Haiti is in dire need of massive reform. Continued U.S. government leadership, both in terms of financial but also technical support, is needed to adequately address the scale of Haiti's education problem. In particular, the expertise of the government and its partners in post-crisis educational recovery is a specialized skill and comparative advantage that should be brought to bear over the long-term. This is important not only for the future of Haiti's children, but also for training of the youth and adults that is needed to improve Haiti's security, energy, agriculture and healthcare.

HUMAN RIGHTS

THE U.N. WOMEN'S TREATY: THE CASE AGAINST RATIFICATION

By Christina Hoff Sommers. American Enterprise Institute. March 23, 2010. 26 pages.

<http://www.aei.org/docLib/20100323-CEDAW-Sommers.pdf>

In the late 1970s, a United Nations committee drafted a treaty called the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. CEDAW commits signatory nations to abolishing discrimination against women and also to ensuring their "full development and advancement" in all areas of public and private life. The document was adopted by the General Assembly and submitted to the U.N.'s member states in 1979. Since then nearly every nation has ratified what has come to be known as the "Women's Treaty" or the "Women's Magna Carta." The only holdouts are three Islamic states (Iran, Sudan, and Somalia), a few Pacific islands, the Vatican, and . . . the United States.

IRAN

GEOPOLITICS OF THE IRANIAN NUCLEAR ENERGY PROGRAM: BUT OIL AND GAS STILL MATTER

By Robert E. Ebel. Center for Strategic and International Studies. A Report of the CSIS Energy and National Security Program. March 12, 2010. 57 pages.

http://csis.org/files/publication/100312_Ebel_IranNuclear_web.pdf

Relations between the United States and Iran in recent months have been defined by Iranian intransigence and U.S. stubbornness, all because Iran has continued to insist its

nuclear program is for peaceful purposes whereas the United States and allied countries remain convinced the real purpose is to produce a nuclear weapon. This report tracks the almost daily development of this issue, thus allowing the reader to arrive at his own conclusion, which in turn may change over time.

CAN IRAN'S ACCELERATING NUCLEAR PROGRAM BE STOPPED?

By Leonard S. Spector. YaleGlobal. March 10, 2010.

<http://yaleglobal.yale.edu/content/can-irans-accelerating-nuclear-program-be-stopped>

Iran appears to have stepped up its efforts to produce a nuclear weapon amid new information about its level of technological expertise and its dealings with North Korea, according to nonproliferation expert Leonard S. Spector. Iran has been able to enrich uranium to the 19.75 percent level, a significant step toward producing weapons-grade uranium. That Iran wants to enrich all of its uranium supply to this level, beyond what it would likely need for medical isotopes, suggests the desire and wherewithal to build a nuclear weapon.

U.S.-IRANIAN RELATIONS: AN ANALYTIC COMPENDIUM OF U.S. POLICIES, LAWS, AND REGULATIONS

The Atlantic Council. March 9, 2010. 166 pages.

http://www.acus.org/files/publication_pdfs/65/US-IranRelations.pdf

This Compendium contains the text of major regulations, laws, and other documents governing U.S. interactions with Iran. Also provided are the text of U.N. Security Council Resolutions, agreements between Iran and several other countries on various issues, and other documents that represent major policy decisions in U.S. relations with Iran. The publication was launched at an Atlantic Council panel discussion on U.S.-Iran relations.

HOW TO READ BRAZIL'S STANCE ON IRAN

By Matias Spector. Council on Foreign Relations. March 4, 2010.

http://www.cfr.org/publication/21576/how_to_read_brazils_stance_on_iran.htm

Brazil's rebuff of U.S. efforts to toughen sanctions against Iran derives from its wariness of U.S. power politics, writes CFR Visiting Fellow Matias Spector, but it's too soon to dismiss Brazil's role.

THE MISSING LEVER: INFORMATION ACTIVITIES AGAINST IRAN

By Michael Eisenstadt. The Washington Institute for Near East Policy. POLICY Notes.

Number 1. March 2010. 8 pages.

<http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/pubPDFs/PolicyNote01.pdf>

Tehran feels compelled to mitigate external pressures generated by new sanctions and a strategic communication campaign while it manages the challenges posed by its domestic opposition. U.S. policymakers may doubt the efficacy of a policy that relies on less tangible sources of leverage such as information activities. Yet experience in Iran and elsewhere shows that such approaches can succeed.

IRAQ

THE IRAQ EFFECT: THE MIDDLE EAST AFTER THE IRAQ WAR

By Frederic Wehrey, Dalia Dassa Kaye, Jessica Watkins, Jeffrey Martini, Robert A. Guffey. RAND Corporation. Prepared for the United States Air Force. March 2010. 217 pages.

http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2010/RAND_MG892.pdf

The conflict in Iraq has reverberated across the Middle East, affecting the balance of power between neighboring states, their internal political dynamics, how their publics view American credibility, and the strategies and tactics of al-Qa'ida. The effects on the broader region will be felt for decades, presenting new challenges and opportunities for U.S. policy. A better understanding of how regional states and nonstate actors have responded to the Iraq conflict will better prepare the United States to manage the war's long-term consequences. To that end, the authors conducted extensive fieldwork in the region and canvassed local media sources to inform their analysis. Among their key findings: The war has facilitated the rise of Iranian power in the region, but Iran faces more limits than is commonly acknowledged; the war has eroded local confidence in U.S. credibility and created new opportunities for Chinese and Russian involvement; the war has entrenched and strengthened neighboring Arab regimes while diminishing the momentum for political reform; and the war has eroded al-Qa'ida's standing in the region, but the network and its affiliates are adapting with new tactics and strategies.

SECURITY IN IRAQ: A FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYZING EMERGING THREATS AS U.S. FORCES LEAVE

By David C. Gompert, Terrence K. Kelly, Jessica Watkins. RAND Corporation. Prepared for the Office of the Secretary of Defense. 2010. 97 pages.

http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2010/RAND_MG911.pdf

U.S. withdrawal from Iraq could affect Iraq's internal security and stability, which could in turn affect U.S. strategic interests and the safety of U.S. troops and civilians in Iraq. U.S. policymakers need a dynamic analytic framework with which to examine the shifting motivations and capabilities of the actors that affect Iraq's security. The framework recognizes dangers from extremists, mainstream political actors, and the politicization of the security forces. It asserts that security in Iraq depends on the major political actors using the political process instead of violence to achieve their goals, and professional, apolitical security forces. Extremist violence, while inevitable, cannot by itself threaten the state. To help achieve U.S. goals in Iraq, longterm U.S.-Iraq military cooperation should have three missions: building security force capability, enhancing its professional character, and building confidence between Iraqi state and Kurdish regional forces.

LEARNING THE RIGHT LESSONS FROM IRAQ

By Benjamin H. Friedman, Harvey Sapolsky and Christopher Preble. CATO Institute. February 13, 2010. 20 pages.

<http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/pa-610.pdf>

Foreign policy experts and policy analysts are misreading the lessons of Iraq. The emerging conventional wisdom holds that success could have been achieved in Iraq with more troops, more cooperation among U.S. government agencies, and better counterinsurgency doctrine. To analysts who share these views, Iraq is not an example of what not to do but of how not to do it. Their policy proposals aim to reform the national security bureaucracy so that we will get it right the next time. The military gives us the power to conquer foreign countries, but not the power to run them. Because there are few good reasons to take on missions meant to resuscitate failed governments, terrorism notwithstanding, the most important lesson from the war in Iraq should be a newfound appreciation for the limits of our power.

ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT

U.S.-ISRAEL: UNSETTLED RELATIONSHIP

By Elliott Abrams, Steven A. Cook, Leslie H. Gelb, Daniel Senor, Steven Simon. Council on Foreign Relations. March 18, 2010.

<http://www.cfr.org/publication/21671/usisrael.html>

U.S.-Israeli relationship has recently experienced an unusual strained patch. CFR experts assess the causes for their divisions over the settlements issue, citing everything from diplomatic bungling to Obama administration aims to destabilize the Israeli coalition.

MISCELLANEOUS

TRANSNATIONAL INSURGENCIES AND THE ESCALATION OF REGIONAL CONFLICT: LESSONS FOR IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN

By Dr Idean Salehyan. Strategic Studies Institute. March 4, 2010. 73 pages.

<http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/download.cfm?q=971>

Many insurgents groups benefit from sanctuaries in neighboring countries where they are relatively safe from state security forces. These transnational insurgencies complicate traditional counterinsurgency operations in significant ways. Most importantly, transnational insurgencies have the potential to spark conflicts between neighboring countries. The report examines several transnational insurgencies that have been active since the end of the Cold War.

ORGANIZING THE U.S. GOVERNMENT TO COUNTER HOSTILE IDEOLOGIES

By Douglas J. Feith and Abram N. Shulsky. The Hudson Institute. March 2010. 28 pages.

http://www.hudson.org/files/publications/Organizing_the_USG_to_Counter_Hostile_Ideologies.pdf

There are organizational challenges to integrating efforts to counter extremist ideology into U.S. national security strategy. How can operations regarding information become a key tool of National security policy? How can the government ensure that such operations receive the necessary resources and high-level attention and are properly coordinated with other policy tools? Would these purposes be served by the creation of a governmental

agency like the old U.S. Information Agency? If so, what should its charter and activities be? What would be its relationship to the State Department? What should be the role of other U.S. government departments and agencies, for example, the Defense Department and CIA?

THE CHALLENGES OF STATE FRAGILITY FOR US AND GLOBAL SECURITY IN AN INTERDEPENDENT WORLD STRATEGY FOR PEACE

Conference Report. The Stanley Foundation. February 2010. 107 pages.

<http://www.stanleyfdn.org/publications/report/SPC09StateFragility.pdf>

The Stanley Foundation used the occasion of its 50th Strategy for Peace Conference at Airline House Conference Center in Warrenton, Virginia, to go beyond the well-worn debates over which bureaucratic agencies or departments should have more funding or authority. Instead, participants addressed the major (often implicit) political/conceptual hurdles still blocking structural changes in U.S. policies and toolkits toward the most fragile, weak, and failing states in the international system.

NATO

TO DEAL WITH NEW CHALLENGES, SHOULD NATO GO GLOBAL?

By Richard Weitz. YaleGlobal. February 26, 2010.

<http://yaleglobal.yale.edu/content/should-nato-go-global>

NATO's top civilian leader, Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen envisions an expanded, global role for NATO. Today, threats to NATO's founding members, let alone the world, tend to be global in nature and frequently from non-state actors. Hence, overcoming such threats requires a globally connected security Alliance. Indeed, as Weitz argues, NATO's biggest challenge is proper coordination in Afghanistan. If the Alliance can't work effectively in that country, there's no point in it trying to become a global policeman.

NUCLEAR

OBAMA'S NEW NUCLEAR POLICIES: A STEP IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION

By Michael E. O'Hanlon. The Brookings Institution. April 7, 2010.

http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2010/0407_nuclear_arms_ohanlon.aspx

With the overlapping events of recent weeks on the nuclear front, the signing of the START Follow-On Treaty and the conclusion of the Nuclear Posture Review, the Obama administration has made a significant and positive mark in dealing with one of the greatest threats to the planet.

PRESIDENT OBAMA MUST NOT REMOVE NUCLEAR WEAPONS FROM EUROPE

By Sally McNamara and Baker Spring. The Heritage Foundation. March 4, 2010. 2 pages.

http://s3.amazonaws.com/thf_media/2010/pdf/wm2824.pdf

In April 2009, President Barack Obama laid out the centerpiece of his foreign policy vision for his Administration: the global eradication of nuclear weapons. The authors believe, at this time, however, a withdrawal of America's nuclear arsenal from Europe would send the message that transatlantic security is no longer indivisible. The destabilization brought to the European continent from a premature removal of American nuclear weapons, or an unacceptable degradation of its force, would be a major setback for global security and stability.

CONTROLLING AND SECURING NUCLEAR MATERIALS: MULTILATERAL APPROACHES

Policy Dialogue Brief. The Stanley Foundation. March 2010. 8 pages.

http://www.stanleyfdn.org/publications/pdb/NucMatlsPDB_310.pdf

President Obama's Prague speech in April 2009 laid out his administration's goal of securing all vulnerable nuclear material worldwide within four years. Given the heightened importance of this global effort, the Stanley Foundation convened approximately 35 governmental and nongovernmental officials in Washington on December 2, 2009, to examine practical steps toward meeting this goal. Participants included international leading experts and diplomats, in addition to ranking U.N. officials and U.S. nongovernmental analysts. The group agreed on the importance of making nuclear security a higher global priority and that nuclear security challenges cannot be met without ongoing multilateral action. Participants also examined the role of the upcoming heads of state summit hosted by President Obama and that of the International Atomic Energy Agency in addressing the challenges.

TERRORISM

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THE U.S. FOREIGN TERRORIST ORGANIZATIONS LIST?

By Patrick Clawson. The Washington Institute for Near East Policy. March 18, 2010.

<http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/templateC05.php?CID=3188>

The United States maintains a range of "terrorist lists," of which the Foreign Terrorist Organizations (FTO) list is one of the better known. But in two recent court cases, the U.S. government has offered arguments that raise questions about the purpose of the list.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION IN COUNTERTERRORISM: REDEFINING THE THREAT AND THE REQUIREMENT

By Anthony H. Cordesman. Center for Strategic and International Studies. March 17, 2010. 72 pages.

http://csis.org/files/publication/100316_New_Reports_International_Cooperation_Counterterrorism.pdf

It is far easier to talk about international cooperation in fighting terrorism than it is to achieve it. The world has made real progress in recent years, at both the formal and informal levels. At the same time, national differences still pose serious limits to what can be achieved and the threat is changing. Even if one only focuses on the "greater Middle East," the threat now involves far more than terrorism per se and non-state actors.

Cooperation in counter terrorism must deal with these changes and with the fact that there are no clear boundaries between terrorism and insurgency, and that terrorism is only a symptom of a far broader ideological struggle.

AL-QAEDA CENTRAL AND THE INTERNET

By Daniel Kimmage. New America Foundation. March 16, 2010. 19 pages.

<http://counterterrorism.newamerica.net/sites/newamerica.net/files/policydocs/kimmage2.pdf>

Al-Qaeda's media strategy in 2009 reflected the group's attempts to meet the triple challenge of a shifting media landscape, its enmeshment in the Afghanistan-Pakistan nexus, and the global jihadist movement's failures over the last several years. The results are ambiguous. Al-Qaeda appears to be holding the attention of the faithful, but it faces a rising din of competing voices, an Internet that is more and more of a mixed blessing, and less resonance in mainstream Arab media than in years past.

A GROWING TERRORIST THREAT?: ASSESSING "HOMEGROWN" EXTREMISM IN THE UNITED STATES

By Rick "Ozzie" Nelson and Ben Bodurian. Center for Strategic and International Studies. March 8, 2010. 21 pages.

http://csis.org/files/publication/100304_Nelson_GrowingTerroristThreat_Web.pdf

The report discusses five events that occurred during the fall of 2009 which thrust concerns over "homegrown" terrorism or extremist violence perpetrated by U.S. legal residents and citizens into public view.

Previous issues of Foreign Policy -- Defense -- Documents on the Web are available at:

<http://france.usembassy.gov/web-alert.html>